

## REMARKS

### INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 3 and 4 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claim 1 has been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 5-10 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

### ENTRY OF AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:

Applicant(s) request(s) entry of this Rule 116 Response because:

(a) the amendment(s) were not earlier presented because Applicant(s) believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(b) the amendment of claim 1 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and

(c) the amendment does not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for purposes of appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised.

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in Section 714.12 that "any amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." Moreover, Section 714.13 sets forth that "the Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

In the Office Action, at page 2, item 2, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara (U.S. Patent No. 5,682,847 – hereinafter Hara) in view of Bloomfield (U.S. Patent No. 2,439,415 – hereinafter Bloomfield), Siegla (U.S. Patent No. 4,249,488 – hereinafter Siegla), and Sheldon (U.S. Patent No. 5,960,617 – hereinafter Sheldon), and further in view of Okubo et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,601,555 – hereinafter Okubo). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 5, item 3, the Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara in view of Bloomfield, Siegla, and Sheldon, further in view of Okubo; and further in view of Nagano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,678,305 – hereinafter Nagano). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 5, item 4, the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara in view of Bloomfield, Siegla, and Sheldon, and further in view of Wing (U.S. Patent No. 4,790,703 – hereinafter Wing). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 6, item 5, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara in view of Bloomfield, Siegla, and Sheldon, further in view of Okubo, and further in view of Isler (U.S. Patent No. 4,790,703 – hereinafter Isler). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the Office Action, at page 6, item 6, the Examiner rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara in view of Bloomfield, Siegla, and Sheldon, and further in view of Okubo, and further in view of Kimak (U.S. Patent 4,990,044 – hereinafter Kimak). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. Applicants traverse this rejection and respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter of claims 3 and 4 have been incorporated into claim 1.

Amended, independent claim 1 recites: "...respective portions of mutually confronting inner surfaces of the opposite side walls have helical partial threads therein in continuity with an internally helically extending thread of the internally threaded hole, to threadingly receive the adjustment screw."

Regarding the rejection of claim 4, in FIGS. 18a, 18b, and 19, to which the Examiner points (by citing reference number 24), Nagano discloses a cubic valve stem receiving element 28 that is welded between the side walls 11c. Only the valve stem receiving element 28 has a threaded hole (screw hole 24). There is no indication that the side walls 11c have any threads. (See Nagano, at col. 8, lines 29-46).

With the claimed arrangement, the adjustment screw can be engaged not only with the arm body through the internally threaded hole defined in the arm body, but also with the opposite side walls via the partial threads. Thus, portions of the opposite side walls can be utilized to define an extension of the internal helical thread of the internally threaded hole and, therefore, the adjustment screw can firmly be threaded at an increased threading strength. Accordingly, with no need to increasing the wall thickness of the plate metal used as a material for the arm body, a sufficient threading strength and a sufficient strength of that portion of the arm body adjacent and around the internally threaded hole can be effectively secured.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nagano neither discloses nor suggests, either alone or in combination with the other cited references, partial threads on confronting surfaces of opposite walls in continuity with a threaded hole of an arm body, to receive an adjustment screw.

Claim 9 recites: "...wherein the flanged nut comprises a flange having an annular end face that is rounded inwardly to represent an annular spherical end face."

Regarding claim 9, Isler discloses a nut 15 with an annular end face that is rounded outwardly and represents an annular spherical end face. In claim 9, the claimed annular end face is rounded inwardly to represent an annular spherical end face.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art, and should be allowable for at least the above-mentioned reasons. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2, and 5-10, which depend from independent claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the cited art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.


If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 27, 2004

By:   
Michael A. Bush  
Registration No. 48,893

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501